	Case 2:05-cv-01846-JLR Documer	nt 15 Filed 03/29/06 Page 1 of 2
01		
02		
03		
04	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
05	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
06	CURT F. HANSFORD,	CASE NO. C05-1846-MAT
07	Petitioner,	
08	v.)	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S
09	JOSEPH LEHMAN,	MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
10	Respondent.	
11)	
12	Petitioner is a state prisoner who has filed <i>pro se</i> a petition for habeas corpus pursuant to	
13	28 U.S.C. § 2254. Respondent has filed her answer to the petition. (Doc. #10). In his response	
14	to respondent's answer, petitioner includes a motion to amend his petition to name a proper	
15	respondent and also seeks appointment of counsel. (Doc. #13). In support of his motion for	
16	counsel, petitioner has submitted an affidavit from a woman named Tarea Lujan, who states that	
17	petitioner suffers from a medical condition – "Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder" – that	
18	interferes with his ability to represent himself. (Doc. #14). The court, having considered	
19	petitioner's motion, the affidavit, and the balance of the record, does hereby find and ORDER:	
20	(1) Petitioner's motion to amend his petition to name a proper respondent is	
21	GRANTED. Petitioner's petition is hereby amended to name Alice Payne as respondent instead	
22	of Joseph Lehman.	
	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -1	

13

14 15

16

17

19

18

20

22

21

Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. #13) is DENIED. There is (2) no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 unless an evidentiary hearing is required. See McCleskey v. Zant, 499 U.S. 467, 495 (1991); Rule 8(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings for the United States District Courts, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

Although the court may exercise its discretion to appoint counsel for a financially eligible individual where the "interests of justice so require" under 18 U.S.C. § 3006A, petitioner fails to demonstrate that the interests of justice would be best served by appointment of counsel in this matter. The court notes that Ms. Lujan, who attests in her affidavit to petitioner's medical condition, does not claim to be a doctor, nurse, or health professional of any kind. Therefore, her affidavit is of questionable probative value regarding petitioner's mental ability. In addition, even if the affidavit were given weight, the court notes that petitioner has been able to file a response to respondent's answer, and the matter is ready for consideration by the court.

(3) The Clerk shall direct copies of this Order to petitioner, to counsel for respondent, and to the Honorable James L. Robart.

DATED this 29th day of March, 2006.

United States Magistrate Judge

DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -2